DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 643 CS 500 890

AUTHOR Atwood, L. Erwin; Sanders, Keith R.
TITLE Perceived Dimensions of Political Campaign Communication.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (New Orleans, Louisiana, April 17-20, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Elections; Higher Education; *Media Research; Newspapers; Political Attitudes; *Political Issues; Television; *Television Research; Voting
IDENTIFIERS *Ticket Splitting

ABSTRACT

Advocates of the "new politics" have argued that the use of television for political campaigning can be effectively utilized to encourage and enhance the probability of split ticket voting. Derivation and analysis of seven perceived dimensions of political campaign communication among registered voters finds television unrelated to voting behavior. The print media dimension and media believability discriminate among voter groups. (Author)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 098643

PERCEIVED DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGN COMMUNICATION

L. Erwin Atwood and Keith R. Sanders

Southern Illinois University
Carbondale

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Erwin Atwood
Keith R. Sanders

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO-
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER

Presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, April, 1974

CS 500 892

The complex of communications assaulting the individual each day provides a potentially bewildering array of messages from many sources through many channels, both interpersonal and mass media. If the individual is to avoid being overwhelmed by this cacophony, he must somehow organize these stimuli into broad classifications which can accommodate familiar and unfamiliar elements without undue effort.[1]

The number and content of message categories an individual may have will depend in part on his intellectual capacity and interests, on relative "information costs"[2] and in part on the ways we go about asking him to describe his communication environment. Our primary concern here is with the classifications, or dimensions, voters have for the multitude of political communications which invades their perceptual world during an election campaign and the relationships between those classifications and voting behavior. In other words, does the structure and content of the symbolic environment which voters create for themselves during periods of high political communication density relate to the ways they vote? This, we believe, is a question of considerable significance.

Nimmo[3] develops briefly a theory of perceputal effects which is

offered as an alternative to attitudinally based explanations of voting behavior. With an admittedly sparse data base, he concludes that given the inherent limitations of the political campaign context, campaign outcomes can be best explained through a study of perceptions rather than through studies of attitudes and values. Moreover, the growing evidence in support of the agenda-setting function[4] of political mass communication supports the thesis that we need to know much more about the relationship between "agenda," the voter's newly acquired perceptions, and his subsequent political behavior.

However, by far the greatest stimulus for this study is the considerable attention which has recently been given to the growing phenomenon known as "ticket-splitting," and the concomitant decline of political party affiliation and socio-economic status as predictors of voting behavior. With the advent of the "new politics," the focus of attention has begun to swing away from traditional predictors to the channels of political communication, particularly the mass media.[5]

Part of the increased interest in ticket splitting appears to stem from the fact that during the past 20 years there has been a dramatic decline in the proportion of voters casting a straight party ballot. Ogden[6] and Campbell and Miller[7] reported that 66 per cent of the voters interviewed claimed to have voted a straight party ballot in 1952. By 1956 the proportion had dropped to 61 per cent, and by 1968 the proportion of straight ballot voters had dropped to 43 per cent.[8] The reasons for split ticket voting traditionally have been given in terms of social and political variables such as cross-pressures on the voter as a

member of divergent reference groups.[9] Campbell and Miller[10] consider party identification and voter convictions about the candidate and the issues as the primary reasons for voting a straight ballot.

In addition to these motivational variables, physical conditions of voting, such as the long ballot and single choice ballots, can exert an influence on the way the voter performs in the voting booth. Key[11] points out that in situations where the long ballot existed, it was not unusual to find a number of offices left unmarked by the voter, particularly those near the end of the ballot. In states where the voter can vote a straight ballot with a single pencil mark or a flick of a single lever, straight party voting may be encouraged, particularly among the politically uninformed and apathetic. However, both Key[12] and Campbell and Miller[13] report that regardless of whether a state permits a single mark or requires multiple marking, voters with strong party identifications cast straight ballots in about the same proportions.

As the role of party identification as an influence on candidate choice appeared to decline in the 1960s, mass media campaign strategies were developed to take advantage of the presumed power and the apparent personal nature of television. The objective of many campaigns, according to DeVries and Tarrance,[14] was to encourage split ticket voting because some candidates wished not to be closely associated with their party. Television, they argue, is ideally suited for the creation of individual candidate "images" that could be considered independent from party associations. While television may be capable of creating a specific desired candidate image, it does not necessarily follow that the public will vote

for that image. How much television contributed to the increased numbers of ticket splitters and to what extent both the growth of television campaigning and split ticket voting are the outcomes of other conditions is impossible to assess. Nevertheless, campaign planners took their television seriously.

> TV brings the action directly to the viewer. It is personal, it is completely realistic. It is direct communication often staged and embellished for a desired effect, but pure and basic, virtually person to person.[15]

Several factors contributed to this emphasis on television, not the least of which may be the perceived importance of the medium based simply on household penetration which LoSciuto[16] has estimated to be in excess of 96 per cent. Further support of the new politics writers and planners high regard for television comes from survey data published by the Television Information Office[17] reporting that increasing numbers of Americans were claiming they obtained most of their information about public affairs from television. In 1959, for example, 51 per cent of the respondents named television as their principal news source. The proportion rose steadily in each succeeding study with 62 per cent citing television as the principal news source in 1971. As a further boost to the views of the television oriented campaigner, a majority of Americans also claim television is the most believable source of information.[18]

However, other studies fail to support the findings of the Roper surveys. Robinson[19] and Vinyard and Sigel[20] found print media usage to

be much more crucial in explaining differentials in information levels than broadcast media usage. Even more important was Robinson's [21] finding that heavy television news viewers are less able to identify personalities in the news than is the less regular viewer, a finding that appears to be a direct contradiction of the arguments of the proponents of the new politics. Vinyard and Sigel[22] reported that although their respondents said they obtained more news from television than from any other source, these viewers appeared to place less importance on television news than on information obtained from newspapers. Robinson[23] has also reported that the perceived bias of newspapers can account for as much as a six per cent differential in voting behavior.

The American Institute for Political Communication[24] has reported that community influentials and Republicans tend to use print media while the general public and Democrats tend to rely on television. Clarke and Ruggels[25] and Troldahl, et al.[26] have reported a general preference for print media for news about public affairs. Bogart[27] and Robinson[28] give data indicating that on any given week day substantially larger proportions of the nation's adults read a daily newspaper than watch a television newscast. LoSciuto[29] estimated that on the average day only 43 per cent of the viewers watched a national network newscast and 50 per cent watched a local news program. Additionally, only eight per cent of the viewers nationally reported they watched television to keep up with current events while 76 per cent said they watched for entertainment, relaxation, or to kill time.

There is, it seems, in the literature on the subject, much apparent inconsistency, conceptual slippage, and theoretical poverty, partly

because more complicated multivariate aspects of the voter's complex perceptual dimensions have been neglected and partly because the empirical relationships between voter perceptions and his behavior have been more often assumed than measured by authors of recent books on the art of political campaigning.

Although studies of human information processing[30] indicate the individual's ability to attend to and discriminate among stimuli is limited and clustering or lumping of stimuli seems necessary if the voter is to make sense of a political campaign, neither theoretical nor empirical bases are available for predicting the number of dimensions a voter might use or the cognitive structure of those dimensions. Miller's[31] work would suggest we might anticipate between five and nine dimensions. Shaffer[32] found all communication variables clustering on a single factor; his investigation included relatively few communication variables, and his variable set included many non-communication items. All variables in this study are related to interpersonal or mass communication.

Conventional wisdom might lead us to expect three basic dimensions--mass media, campaign organizations, and primary interpersonal contacts. In terms of our questions (see footnote, Table 1), we might find media use, perceived media influence, information seeking, perceived media believability, and message content dimensions. Or, in view of the media use reported above, we might expect newspapers and magazines to cluster together with television and radio perceived as separate entities because of the differential emphasis these media receive both in terms of audience use and as campaign communication channels. Interpersonal communication

variables, both campaign related and those of a casual interpersonal nature, may be perceived in just those relationships--campaign and non-campaign dimensions. In this context we would expect five dimensions of campaign communication--television, radio, magazines and newspapers, interpersonal communication, and campaign organizations. For the moment, we feel, the number and nature of the dimensions are empirical questions.

This brings us to the question of what relationships might exist between perceived dimenions of communication and voting behavior. If the new politics proponents are correct, television should be a prime discriminator among those who vote a split ballot and those who vote a straight ballot with the split ballot voters showing the higher association with television. This relationship is the fundamental premise of the new politics. However, as we have shown elsewhere,[33] television probably does not discriminate between the simply dichotomy of straight and split ticket voters. The larger question we address in this analysis is whether or not television and other communication variables discriminate among self-designated party affiliates who vote either a straight or split ballot.

As we have outlined above, differential media use is related to differential information levels, and the print media show the highest association with high information levels. We cannot accept the general argument of the new politics that high television viewing will be an indicator of ticket splitting when television viewing admittedly is used by so few viewers for information purposes. If 57 per cent of the voters cast split ballots in 1968 and at the same time only eight per cent of the voters were utilizing television for current information, television

would seem either to have powers to sway voter decisions even beyond those attributed to it by the television campaign proponents or there are other channels of information more strongly related to differential voting behavior.

Ticket splitting has been defined in a variety of ways. Ogden[34] identifies 46 different classifications of ticket splitters. Campbell and Miller[35] offer five classifications, and DeVries and Tarrance[36] map 10 different patterns. None of the classifications provides a compelling argument for its selection, and in view of the exploratory nature of our analysis we chose the least complicated approach. For purposes of this study, a ticket splitter is any voter who crossed party lines at least once while voting for the candidates appearing in the top six offices on his state's ballot.[37] This classification, when combined with the traditional party affiliation, or non-affiliation in the case of independents, provides six groups among which we can attempt to discriminate on the bases of the derived dimensions of political communication.[38]

METHOD

The data reported here are part of a larger set collected from registered voters in three Southern Illinois counties and St. Louis County, Missouri, during the two weeks prior to the 1972 general election. Data were collected by personal interview from 247 registered voters in the three rural Southern Illinois counties and from 172 registered voters in suburban St. Louis County.[39] In the analysis we were concerned with 44 variables tapping voter perceptions of (1) the amount of information obtained from various sources, (2) believability of information from each

source, (3) the kinds of information the respondent felt he was receiving, (4) the perceived influence of each source, and (5) the perceived usefulness of each source for seeking information about political questions.

Factor analysis[40] of the responses isolated the underlying dimensions of the communication variables. To test for relationships between the communication dimensions derived in the factor analysis and voting behavior, multiple discriminant analysis[41] was used to determine if the factors were related to self-reports of party affiliation and ticket splitting. The six apriori groups in the multiple discriminant analysis were self-designated Republicans, Democrats, and independents who voted either a straight or split ballot. In addition, we were interested in determining if the perceived communication dimensions were related to political self-designation irrespective of voting. In this multiple discriminant model only three criterion groups were used--self-designated Republicans, Democrats, and independents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overall, 32 per cent of our respondents (116 voters) voted a straight party ballot, a proportion somewhat lower than the nationwide figure of 40 per cent reported by Gallup.[42] Of the 113 self-designated independents, 85.8 per cent (97 voters) voted a split ticket compared with 52.9 per cent of the Republicans (45 of 85 voters) and 62.9 per cent of the Democrats (105 of 167 voters). The proportion of independents voting a split ballot is significantly larger than the proportion of either Republicans or Democrats ($p < .05$), and a significantly larger proportion of Democrats than Republicans cast a split ballot ($p < .05$). Of the 16 self-designated

independents who voted a straight ticket, eight voted Democrat and eight voted Republican.[43] Overall, independents reported a significantly higher ($p < .01$) strength of political belief than did either Republicans or Democrats. The means on a seven-point scale were 5.53, 4.82, and 4.98 respectively. There is no significant difference between Republicans and Democrats. Straight ticket voters reported a signficantly higher ($p < .01$) strength of political belief (5.73) than did split ballot voters (4.82).

In terms of belief in the media, 52.6 per cent of the sample listed television as the most believable medium. Newspapers were second with 25.2 per cent. Other people were listed as most believable by 8.8 per cent, magazines by 8.2 per cent, and radio by 5.2 per cent of the respondents. In addition, 62.7 per cent of the respondents listed television as the medium from which they obtained most of their information about the campaign. Newspapers were listed as the first source by 22.7 per cent followed by radio, other people, and magazines with 5.2, 4.9 and 4.4 per cent respectively. Thus, twice as many people said they would believe television as would believe newspapers, and nearly three times as many said they obtained most of their campaign information from television as compared with the newspaper. These questions were of the Roper type, and the findings are consistent with those reported by the Roper surveys. However, we did not permit multiple responses to the questions, as does Roper, and these data are not included in the set of variables factor analyzed. Thus it would appear that our respondents exhibit much the same media use and belief patterns reported by Roper for national samples, and should we find television not related to voting behavior we can hardly

attribute that finding to differences between our respondents' reported belief and use of media and that of national samples.

Factor Analysis

The factor analysis isolated seven dimensions of campaign communication in the set of 44 variables (see Table 1). Total variance accounted for was 43.75 per cent (87.68 per cent of common factor variance); the proportions of variance accounted for by each of the principal axis factors and the eigenvalues are given in Table 1. The seven factors indicate that voters make clear distinctions among the different sources of political information and not only separate campaign from non-campaign sources and print from broadcasting, but they discriminate among various characteristics of campaign sources and information.

Factor 1, Television.--All television variables clustered in Factor 1. The voters appear not to differentiate among the content of the medium--advertising and news--or to distinguish between television as a medium of communication and the content of the channel. Believability appears to be more medium-related for television than for the other mass media. The believability variable for television was the lowest loading variable in the factor (.371), but it was also factorially complex with a nearly equal loading (.338) on Factor 7, a Media Believability factor. There are no significant correlations between Factor 1 and other factors. The correlations between factors are given in Table 2.

Factor 2, Campaign Influence.--Campaign sources related to perceived influence and helpfulness of these sources in political information seeking appear in this factor. This is one of two dimensions that separate campaign

related sources from all other communication considerations. Respondents appear to be differentiating those sources of information that are under the control of the candidate or his campaign organization from mass media sources and more casual interpersonal communication sources. The only campaign related influence variable not appearing in Factor 2 was "candidate" which appears in Factor 4 and had negligible loadings (absolute value of .216 or less) on all factors. The only factor with which the Campaign Influence factor has a significant correlation is Factor 4 ($r = .34$; $p < .05$).

Factor 3, Print Media.--All print media variables except for the believability items appear in this dimension. No distinctions are made between newspapers and magazines or between news magazines and the more generalized term "magazine." None of the variables is factorially complex, indicating that the respondents clearly differentiate between printed mass media and other communication channels and between the channels and the content since content variables fall in Factor 4. The Print Media factor is negatively correlated with Factor 4 ($r = -.47$; $p < .001$), with which Factor 2 is positively correlated, but Print Media is uncorrelated with the Campaign Influence factor, Factor 2.

Factor 4, Campaign Information.--Variables concerned with types of campaign information--candidates and issues--and the amount of information obtained from predominantly campaign controlled sources cluster in Factor 4. The factor is not as clearly interpretable as are the other factors, but as is the case with the Campaign Influence factor, the emphasis is on those variables that are at least partially under the control of the candidates or their organizations.

While mass media as channels do not appear in this factor, media content such as editorials, political advertising, and news reporters do. It would seem that the voters view these media items as dependent upon the campaign organization for the information they present. While this is obviously the case with paid advertising, it is interesting to find voters locating editorials and news reporters in the same dimension as obviously campaign controlled information variables such as advertising. News reporters have a low secondary loading (.274) on the Television factor, and editorials have a secondary loading of .231 on the Print Media factor. However, these secondary loadings are too small to be of consequence. Two believability items, political mailings and campaign telephone calls, are included in this factor, but both variables have substantial secondary loadings on the Campaign Influence factor and low loadings on the Believability factor.

Factor 5, Interpersonal.--The Interpersonal dimension excludes all campaign related individuals such as candidates and campaign workers as well as all mass media sources, channels, and content. Of primary concern is the perceived influence of apparently non-purposive sources--friends, relatives, spouse. The only information seeking variable in the Interpersonal factor is the perceived helpfulness of friends when one is seeking political information. The Interpersonal factor has no significant correlations with other factors.

Factor 6, Radio.--All radio variables except believability of radio information appear in this cluster. Respondents appear not to differentiate between radio as a medium and the content of the medium--news and advertising--as was the case with Television and Print Media. There is

a significant positive correlation between the Radio factor and Factor 7, Media Believability ($r = .53$; $p < .001$).

Factor 7, Believability.--The Believability factor contains all variables about the believability of radio, magazines, and newspapers. Television, as noted above, has its second highest loading on the Believability factor, but the loading is low. Also pointing to the clear consideration by the respondents of the differential believability of sources and media is the finding that the believability of two campaign controlled variables, campaign literature and telephone calls, fell in Factor 4 and the believability of "people you talked to" fell in the Interpersonal factor. Believability, or credibility, may be a far more complex concept than current research suggests, and possibly the unidimensional ordering of sources and media along some arbitrary continuum, as is the case in the Roper surveys, is more misleading than it is useful. Aside from the positive significant correlation with the Radio factor, the Believability factor has no significant relationships with other dimensions.

Overall then, our respondents appear to perceive clear distinctions among the media as well as other channels of political communication. They do not seem to make distinctions between some media and media content, nor do they always distinguish between advertising and news. They do make a clear distinctions between media believability and the medium and its content with the exception of television. The factor structure presents a clear cognitive organization of the 44 communication variables in seven dimensions.

Multiple Discriminant Analysis

The multiple discriminant analysis was designed to attempt to differentiate among the six criterion voter groups on the bases of each respondent's association with each of the dimensions derived in the factor analysis. For each individual a factor score (z-score) was computed on each factor showing that individual's association with the factor. The z-scores were the predictor variables.

Overall differentiation among the six party preference-vote groups by the seven factors was significant (Wilks Lambda = 0.857; $F = 1.58$, $p < .025$). Five roots extracted 100 per cent of the variance, but only the first root was significant (chi square = 35.71, $p < .001$), and it accounted for 65.6 per cent of the variance.

There was no significant differentiation among the three self-designated political groups--Republicans, Democrats, independents--when reported voting behavior was not taken into account. Hence, it would appear that party preference is not particularly meaningful in terms of perceptions of campaign communication sources and information.

Two factors clearly differentiated among the voter groups. The Print Media factor discriminated ($F = 5.31$; $p < .001$) between the independent ticket splitters who had the highest mean factor score (.27) and the independent straight ticket voters who had the lowest mean factor score (-.41). The Believability factor differentiated between Republican split ticket voters and independent straight ticket voters ($F = 2.68$; $p < .05$). The Republicans had a mean factor score of .37 while the independent straight ticket voters had a score of -.40 on the Believability factor.

The only other factor to approach significance ($.05 < p < .10$) was the Radio factor. As was the case with the Believability factor, the highest criterion group mean was for Republicans who voted a split ticket (.23) while the lowest was for independents who voted a straight ticket (-.34). Group means on each factor and F-ratios for the univariate analyses of variance are given in Table 3.

The "near miss" with the radio factor seems important since it follows the general pattern indicating that communication variables that discriminate among voter groups are media that currently are accorded little importance by the advocates of the new politics. Among the Print media variables, magazines appear to be the most important as they consistently have the highest loadings on the Print factor. The Believability factor consisted of print and radio variables and was correlated with the Radio factor.

One striking consistency runs through these findings. In all cases where the factors differentiated among voting groups, the self-designated independent who voted a straight ballot shows the strongest negative relationship to the communication variables. While we have too few cases for an extensive post hoc analysis, the raw data show that in response to the Roper type questions, none of these 16 independents listed magazines as either the primary source of information or the most believable source. Further, only one independent straight ticket voter listed the newspaper as the primary source of political information while an average of 23 per cent of all other groups listed the newspaper.

The only other group in which no respondent listed magazines as a

primary source of political information was the Republican straight ticket voter; yet 20 per cent of this group listed the newspaper as the most believable source. The independent straight ticket voter appears to rely on interpersonal communication for political information to a greater extent than do other groups. Nearly 19 per cent of the straight ticket independents compared with 3.3 per cent of the other groups said they obtained most of their information from people they talked to. And nearly twice as many Republicans and independent straight ticket voters, 12 per cent, as Democrats and independent ticket splitters, 6.9 per cent, said they would be most likely to believe other people over media sources if they were faced with conflicting reports about a campaign event. These outcomes suggest that the independent straight ticket voter may be apolitical and not very well informed. It is possible, of course, that these 16 respondents, 10 from Southern Illinois and six from St. Louis County, are party adherents who simply refused to acknowledge their party affiliation at the time of the interview. Inspection of the group means in Table 3 also shows:

1. All straight ticket voting groups have negative scores on all mass media dimensions.
2. All straight ticket voting groups have negative scores on the Believability dimension.
3. Republican ticket splitters have positive scores on all dimensions.
4. Independent straight ticket voters have negative scores on all dimensions.
5. The average score for the three split ticket groups is three times as large for Print (.18) and twice as large for Radio (.13) as it is for Television (.06).

6. The average score for the three straight ticket groups is less negative for television (-.14) than for Print (-.37) and Radio (-.24).

If television were a major consideration in the voting behavior of the split ticket voter, the outcomes in 5. and 6. above should be reversed and split ticket voters should have the highest association with television.

Overall, our findings provide no support for the arguments that television is the crucial communication channel in trying to induce ticket splitting. Although over half of our respondents reported they obtained most of their political information from television and nearly two-thirds said television was the most believable medium, other communication variables show stronger relationships to ticket splitting, and among the straight ticket voters television was the least rejected of the seven communication dimensions. Our findings are consistent with those of Robinson, Vinyard and Sigel and others who have reported the highest relationships exist between political participation and print media usage. While people may <u>say</u> they get most of their political campaign information from television and they may <u>say</u> television is the most believable, they may receive, but not readily recognize vastly greater amounts of information and influence about political campaigns from other sources.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a more detailed discussion of the mosaic nature of the mass media environment see Samuel L. Becker, "Rhetorical Studies for the Contemporary World," in Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin Black, eds., The Prospect of Rhetoric, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), pp. 21-43.

2. Anthony Downs, An Economic Theory of Democracy, (New York: Harper and Row, 1957).

3. Dan D. Nimmo, The Political Persuaders: The Techniques of Modern Election Campaigns, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970).

4. M. E. McCombs and D. L. Shaw, "The Agenda-Setting Function of the Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly, 36 (1972), pp. 176-187; M. E. McCombs, D. L. Shaw, and E. F. Shaw, "The News and Public Response: Three Studies of the Agenda-Setting Power of the Press," paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Carbondale, Ill., August 1972; M. E. McCombs and David Weaver, "Voters' Need for Orientation and Use of Mass Media," paper presented to the International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada, April 1973; Thomas A. Bowers, "Newspaper Political Advertising and the Agenda-Setting Function," Journalism Quarterly, 50 (1973), pp. 552-560.

5. Robert Agranoff, The New Style in Election Campaigns, (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972); Harold Mendelsohn and Irving Crespi, Polls, Television and the New Politics, (Scranton, Pa.: Chandler, 1970); Joe McGinniss, The Selling of the President 1968, (New York: Trident Press, 1969); James M. Perry, The New Politics, (New York: Clarkson N. Potter,

Inc., 1968); Gene Wyckoff, The Image Candidates, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1968). Nimmo, op. cit. argues that the basic communication strategy of the modern election campaign is essentially an advertising model similar to one outlined in John C. Maloney, "Advertising Research and an Emerging Science of Mass Persuasion," Journalism Quarterly, 45 (1964), pp. 517-528. We do not, of course, wish to argue that politicians and political analysts have considered communications problems unimportant. The question is one of relative emphasis.

6. Daniel M. Ogden, Jr., "A Voting Behavior Approach to Split-Ticket Voting in 1952," Western Political Quarterly, 11 (1958), pp. 481-493.

7. Angus Campbell and Warren E. Miller, "The Motivational Basis of Straight and Split Ticket Voting," American Political Science Review, 51 (1957), pp. 293-312.

8. Walter DeVries and V. Lance Tarrance, Jr., The Ticket-Splitter: A New Force in American Politics, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972).

9. See Angus Campbell, Philip Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, The American Voter, (New York: John Wiley &Sons, Inc., 1964); William R. Shaffer, Computer Simulations of Voting Behavior, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972); Kenneth P. Langton, Political Socialization, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969).

10. Campbell and Miller, op. cit.

11. V. O. Key, Jr., Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups, 4th ed., (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1958).

12. Ibid.

13. Campbell and Miller, op. cit.

14. DeVries and Tarrance, op. cit.

15. Herbert M. Baus and William B. Ross, Politics Battle Plan, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1968), p. 317.

16. Leonard A. LoSciuto, "A National Inventory of Television Viewing Behavior," Television and Social Behavior: Vol. IV, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 33-85.

17. Burns W. Roper, An Extended View of Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media, (New York: Television Information Office, 1971).

18. Ibid. Some researchers suggest that the apparent high regard for and use of television reported in the Roper studies is an artifact of the data collection procedures. See for example, D. Vinyard and R. Sigel, "Newspapers and Urban Voters," Journalism Quarterly, 48 (1971), pp. 486-493; Richard F. Carter and Bradley S. Greenberg, "Newspapers or Television: Which Do You Believe?" Journalism Quarterly, 42 (1965), pp. 29-34; E. F. Shaw, "Media Credibility: Taking the Measure of a Measure," Journalism Quarterly, 50 (1973), pp. 306-311.

19. John P. Robinson, "Mass Communication and Information Diffusion," in F. Gerald Kline and Phillip J. Tichenor, eds., Current Perspectives in Mass Communication Research, (Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications, 1972), pp. 71-93. Robinson reported "Readers of news magazines score .6 above average in information levels and non-readers .2 below average, while regular newspaper readers score .2 above average and non-readers .5 below average. In contrast frequent TV news viewers score only .1 above average and nonviewers of news programs only .3 below average." pp. 81-82.

20. Vinyard and Sigel, op. cit.

21. Robinson, op. cit.

22. Vinyard and Sigel, op. cit.

23. John P. Robinson, "Perceived Media Bias and the 1968 Vote: Can the Media Affect Behavior After All?" Journalism Quarterly, 49 (1972), pp. 239-246.

24. Evolution of Public Attitudes Toward the Mass Media During an Election Year, (Washington, D. C.: American Institute for Political Communication, 1969).

25. Peter Clarke and Lee Ruggels, "Preferences Among News Media for Coverage of Public Affairs," Journalism Quarterly, 47 (1970), pp. 464-471.

26. Verling Troldahl, Robert Van Dam, and George B. Robeck, "Public Affairs Information Seeking from Expert Institutionalized Sources," Journalism Quarterly, 42 (1965), pp. 403-412.

27. Leo Bogart, "Changing News Interests and the Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly, 42 (1968), pp. 560-574.

28. John P. Robinson, "The Audience for National Television News," Public Opinion Quarterly, 35 (1971), pp. 403-405.

29. LoSciuto, op. cit.

30. George A. Miller, The Psychology of Communication, (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1967).

32. Shaffer, op. cit.

33. L. Erwin Atwood and Keith R. Sanders, "Mass Communication and Ticket Splitting in the 1972 General Election," paper presented to the International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada, April 1973.

34. Ogden, op. cit.

35. Campbell and Miller, op. cit.

36. DeVries and Tarrance, op. cit.

37. The offices on the two ballots were not identical because there was no U. S. Senate race in Missouri in 1972 and in Missouri Governor and Lt. Governor are separate races while in Illinois the candidates for Governor and Lt. Governor run as a team. Offices listed on the Missouri ballot were: President, U. S. Congressman, Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, and Treasurer. In Illinois the offices were: President, U. S. Senator, U. S. Congressman, Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, and Comptroller.

38. DeVries and Tarrance, op. cit., suggest nine classifications including self-designated Democrats who vote straight Republican and self-designated Republicans who vote straight Democrat as well as splitting the independents who vote a straight ticket into Republican and Democrat classifications. None of our self-designated Republicans or Democrats voted a straight ticket for the other party.

39. Respondents were chosen at random from current lists of registered voters in the Southern Illinois counties. In St. Louis Co., which includes much of the suburban area around the city but not the city proper, census blocks were drawn at random and interviewers were given a specified number of interviews to complete in each block. All interviewers had participated in at least two training sessions and had gathered practice interviews in the field before gathering data for the study. The interview schedule was pretested and revised before data collection began and took an average of 45 minutes to administer. Following completion of the schedule, respondents completed a "secret" ballot in which they could vote for the top seven national and state offices that appeared on their

state's ballot. The voters were instructed to assume the election was being held at the time of the interview. Thirty-one Southern Illinois and 23 St. Louis Co. respondents were dropped from this analysis because of refusals to complete the ballot leaving 365 cases for analysis.

40. The factor analysis was a principal axis solution with rotation to oblique (oblimax) reference structure. Squared multiple correlations were used as communality estimates. A minimum eigenvalue of 1.0 was the criterion for stopping factoring. All factors extracted were rotated. Unweighted factor scores were computed for each respondent on each factor for use in the multiple discriminant analysis. See R. J. Rummel, Applied Factor Analysis, (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970).

41. Donald J. Veldman, Fortran Programming for the Behavioral Sciences, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967). The unweighted factor scores computed for each individual on each factor were the predictor variables and group membership in the different party preference and party preference by vote groups were the criterion measures. The procedure computes centroid factors from the asymetrical data matrix and tests for overall discrimination by Wilks Lambda. Each root is tested for significance by chi square. After computing correlations between each group and each root, univariate analyses of variance are run for each predictor variable. For a detailed discussion of the discriminant function see William W. Cooley and Paul R. Lohnes, Multivariate Data Analysis, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971).

42. Gallup Opinion Index, Report No. 90, December 1972.

43. Campbell and Miller, op. cit., reported that 73 per cent of the self-designated Republicans and 74 per cent of the self-designated

Democrats voted a straight party ballot, and that 49.5 per cent of the self-designated independents voted either straight Republican or straight Democrat. DeVries and Tarrance, op. cit., reported 38.1 per cent of the self-designated independents voted a straight party. Generalizations should probably be avoided at this point since the proportion of voters of any persuasion who can be classified as ticket splitters depends upon the criterion measure. If the split we required were between the offices of President and Governor, substantially fewer voters would qualify as ticket splitters. Among our respondents 14.9 per cent of the Republicans, 26.3 per cent of the Democrats, and 37.2 per cent of the independents split their ballots between President and Governor.

TABLE 1

Oblimax Simple Structure Matrix: N = 365

Variable[b]	Factor Loading[a]						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. People you talked to	004	-034	-093	114	497	101	046
2. Television	465	-078	-179	351	-039	-019	062
3. Newspapers	080	-102	383	184	-076	-094	002
4. Magazines	-184	-025	490	098	-032	029	043
5. Political mailings	-138	335	-059	495	-199	008	060
6. Radio	-157	-060	-158	144	-015	662	450
7. Telephone messages	-097	209	-122	203	-005	094	031
8. Paid political advertisements	129	251	-180	524	-080	018	004
9. Editorials	-052	138	231	347	-093	-054	-039
10. News reporters	274	-019	-033	358	-001	-053	038
11. Candidates	124	151	-017	365	-009	-032	-057
12. Candidates' personal lives	-132	-030	065	155	162	060	-005
13. Campaign issues	107	-041	-001	289	024	058	-032
14. Candidates' personal character	-076	-045	024	280	018	067	-051
15. Candidates' political background	-069	-087	100	288	057	080	021
16. People you talked to	027	-028	-157	067	513	-039	149
17. Television	371	-122	-007	203	084	-010	338
18. Newspapers	056	-112	311	154	039	031	383
19. Magazines	-085	-035	359	182	011	056	433
20. Political mailings	-048	456	-133	556	-046	-045	260
21. Radio	-014	-081	034	134	060	425	642

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Variable[b]	Factor Loading[a] 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Telephone campaign messages	-119	314	-144	353	060	-037	289
23. Friends	044	-017	032	-190	572	061	-072
24. Relatives	-002	066	006	-098	560	-047	020
25. Newspapers	112	017	556	-070	040	016	-023
26. News magazines	-065	-003	709	-139	071	009	007
27. Radio news	017	-063	040	001	-009	709	403
28. Television news	680	-054	079	039	097	041	-032
29. Campaign workers	-024	470	125	064	146	027	-132
30. Political campaign literature	061	621	037	273	012	-039	-196
31. Candidates themselves	112	203	182	216	008	029	-033
32. Television campaign advertising	554	303	-113	146	-004	065	-159
33. Radio campaign advertising	164	236	-102	038	-068	588	146
34. Public officials	-042	452	186	080	073	092	-076
35. Husband/wife	064	063	102	-034	131	025	038
36. Friends	048	084	072	-206	591	-140	003
37. Relatives	018	160	-048	-077	569	-122	119
38. Newspaper	177	122	606	-137	-067	016	047
39. Radio news	164	100	209	-132	-087	577	313
40. News magazines	-010	158	624	-047	-117	086	120
41. Television news	633	063	092	-004	-011	062	054
42. Political campaign literature	075	641	032	306	-063	001	-043

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Variable[b]	Factor Loading[a] 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. Public officials	-050	509	129	104	117	081	049
44. Campaign workers	-032	535	036	128	143	030	012
Variance	.1696	.0807	.0437	.0424	.0367	.0358	.0287
Eigenvalues	7.461	3.553	1.921	1.864	1.614	1.575	1.261

a Decimal points omitted for all factor loadings.

b Questions for the five sets of response variables were:

1-11: Generally, how much information do you feel you have been getting about the candidates and issues from each of these sources of information? (a great deal, quite a bit, hard to say, very little, none)

12-15: Generally, how much information do you feel you have been getting about each of the following: (a great deal, quite a bit, hard to say, very little, none)

16-22: Tell me how believable the information you are getting is from each of these sources. (very believable, somewhat believable, hard to say, slightly believable, not at all believable)

23-35: Generally, how much do you think your opinions about the candidates and the issues have been influenced this year by each of these sources of information? (a lot, quite a bit, hard to say, not very much, not at all)

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

36-44: If you were going to vote tomorrow and wanted some more information about the candidates and issues, how helpful do you think each of these sources of information would be? (very helpful, some help, hard to say, not very helpful, not at all helpful)

TABLE 2

Correlations Between Factors[a]

Factor	Factor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Television 1.	1.0	-17	-03	-10	-07	-15	-25
Campaign Influence 2.		1.0	04	34[b]	-29	-09	-21
Print Media 3.			1.0	-47[b]	-01	-19	-22
Campaign Information 4.				1.0	-29	-09	16
Interpersonal 5.					1.0	-14	13
Radio 6.						1.0	53[b]
Believability 7.							1.0

a Decimals omitted for off-diagonal elements.

b $p < .05$

TABLE 3

Group Means for Univariate ANOVAs

Factor	Straight Ticket			Split Ticket			F
	Rep.	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.	Dem.	Ind.	
Television	-.07	-.10	-.24	.12	.10	-.04	0.76
Campaign Influence	.04	.07	-.06	.14	-.08	-.03	0.43
Print Media	-.32	-.37	-.41	.22	.06	.27	5.21[a]
Campaign Information	-.06	.09	-.02	.18	-.09	-.01	0.60
Interpersonal	-.17	.08	-.10	.16	-.08	-.12	0.96
Radio	-.14	-.25	-.34	.23	.06	.09	1.98
Believability	-.24	-.14	-.40	.37	-.00	.09	2.65[b]

a $p < .001$

b $p < .05$